

PTO/SB/21 (09-06)

Approved for use through 03/31/2007. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	10/534,960-Conf. #1630	
	Filing Date	November 23, 2005	
	First Named Inventor	Peter D. Kozel	
	Art Unit	3739	
	Examiner Name	J. Papapietro	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	3	Attorney Docket Number	B1075.70036US02

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below): Return Receipt Postcard
Remarks		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name	WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.		
Signature	<i>Melissa Beede</i>		
Printed name	Melissa A. Beede		
Date	September 28, 2007	Reg. No.	54,986

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Dated: September 28, 2007

Signature: *Melissa Beede* (Melissa A. Beede)



Docket No.: B1075.70036US02
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE


Applicant: Peter D. Kozel
Serial No.: 10/534,960
Confirmation No.: 1630
Filed: November 23, 2005
For: ELECTROPHYSIOLOGY CATHETER WITH ABLATION
ELECTRODE

Examiner: Papapietro, Jacqueline M.
Art Unit: 3739

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as First Class Mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Dated: September 28, 2007


Melissa A. Beede

Mail Stop Amendment

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO FIRST OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed July 17, 2007, Applicant submits the following remarks.

Upon reviewing the Office Action, it was noted that the Office Action was based on the claims as originally filed, rather than the claims as amended via the Preliminary Amendment filed on May 16, 2005. Applicant's representative, Melissa A. Beede, spoke with the Examiner by telephone on Friday, July 27, 2007 to discuss the same. The Examiner said that she would look into whether a new Office Action addressing the pending claims could be issued. The Examiner followed up with a telephone call on August 1, 2007 and left a message. In her message, the Examiner stated that a formal response needed to be submitted, but that such response need not include arguments and could simply cite our conversation. The Examiner indicated that she would then issue an new Office Action based on the pending claims.